



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/635,078	08/06/2003	Joseph E. Peck	5150-79600	7220	
7590 06/04/2007 Jeffrey C. Hood Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC			EXAMINER		
			VU, TUAN A		
P.O. Box 398 Austin, TX 78767			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Austin, 12 70707			2193		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
,			06/04/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/635,078

PECK, JOSEPH E.

Examiner

Tuan A. Vu

2193

-	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tuan A. Vu	2193	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):		
(1) <u>Tuan A. Vu</u> .	(3)		
(2) Marc Williams.	(4)		
Date of Interview: 25 May 2007.	·		
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2	t)∐ applicant's representa	utive]	
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.		
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1</u> .			
Identification of prior art discussed: _N/A			
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g)□ was not reached. h)∑	☑ N/A.	
Substance of Interview including description of the general reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	nature of what was agreed	to if an agreement	was
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amenda allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no coallowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached	opy of the amendments tha		
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE AN INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVILEMENTS OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVILEMENTS.	last Office action has alrea OF ONE MONTH OR THIF ERVIEW SUMMARY FOR	ady been filed, APP RTY DAYS FROM T M, WHICHEVER IS	LICANT IS THIS LATER, TO
	•		
		•	
	uan	Anlvu	<u> </u>
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	 Examiner's s	ignature, if required	

Application No. 10/635,078

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant's representative expressed the need to have the Examiner clarify on the points made in the last Advisory Action; that is, one of such concerns being how the Examiner failed to construe the 'increased size' limitation of the claims, notably in light of the Examiner's objecting that such size increasing is a fixed scenario without support from the Disclosure. The examiner clarified that the Specifications does describe an invention in which human driven debugging process entails a flexible scenario wherein code can decrease at one end and increse at another, depending on some conditions which are missing in the claim. Also explained was that this last step of having code increase as a claimed would appear non-statutory for lack of useful ending whereas in fact the Specifications does provide circumstances under which the user input process would take alternatives as set forth above, until all the code is succesfully debugged. The Applicant's representative after having been explained on the grounds by which the Advisory action had been effected, agreed to reconsider the claim language to address a proper scenario, in which the above code increase would be rephrased with alternative that would lead to a useful ending, using the Specifications; and so, in the likely prospect as to put the changes in the next response.